THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V. DECEMBER, 1925. No. 12.

When was Jesus Born?

P. E. KRETZMANN, St. Louis, Mo.

The beginning of the Christian era, and therefore the supposed year of Christ's birth, was first fixed by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian monk, who lived in Rome at the beginning of the sixth century. He was greatly interested in computations pertaining to the church-year and did much toward establishing a uniform practise with regard to the celebration of Easter. He placed the birth of Christ in the year 754 a. u. c. (after the founding of the city of Rome). Even before his time several of the Popes of Rome had tried to determine the date of Christ's birth. It is said that Pope Julius I (336—352) had the imperial archives of Rome searched for the exact date of the birth of Christ, and it has been established beyond a doubt that Pope Liberius fixed the celebration of Christmas for December 25. By the middle of the sixth century, then, the date of the birth of Jesus was generally accepted to have been December 25, 754 a. u. c.

In an article in *Lehre und Wehre* of December, 1902, the writer shows that the computation of Dionysius Exiguus was undoubtedly erroneous. Using chiefly chronological tags from the Bible, all of which render the year 754 a. u. c. altogether improbable, the essayist finally concludes that the year 750 a. u. c. is the correct year of Christ's birth and that the Christian era should therefore be moved back four years. This idea was held quite generally among orthodox theologians about two decades ago.

But in the mean time, evidence was brought forth which indicated that a further correction in the computations must be made in order to harmonize facts from secular history with the Scriptural account. Work has been done chiefly by Sir William Ramsay, but subsequently also by Robertson, Deissmann, McKinley, and others, and the difficulty may now be said to have been solved with a reasonable amount of certainty. The argument proceeds

from four points of departure: the time of the vision of Zacharias in the Temple, the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry, the first census of Augustus, and the death of Herod. Of these arguments the first is rather precarious, since it is based upon the date when Zacharias was supposed to have been on duty in the Temple, when "he executed the priest's office before God in the order of his course," Luke 1, 8, namely, that of Abia. Even if the alleged Jewish records were always reliable, the latitude in the matter, according to the Bible account, is so great as to make the element of conjecture disproportionately great. But the other lines of argument are decidedly worth considering.

If we begin with the relation of Herod to the time of Christ's birth, we have a number of facts to consider. In the first place, it is clear that Herod the Great was still ruling in Palestine; for Matthew writes: "Now, when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod, the king." Matt. 2, 1. Moreover, some time must be allowed between the birth of Jesus and the death of the cruel tyrant. The Magi clearly left their home in search of the new-born King only after His birth had actually taken place. Matt. 2, 2. 3. The journey from the East to Jerusalem occupied some time, even if we assume that the men traveled with all speed. Some time must be allowed for the consultation with the priests, as it was arranged by Herod. Matt. 2, 4 ff. Then, again, Herod may well have allowed a week or two for the Magi to return to Jerusalem before he staged the slaughter of the innocents. And, finally, to take only one more Scripture tag at this point, a further period of time must be figured before the death of Herod, since Joseph and Mary were evidently in Egypt for some time, for they were to remain in Egypt until they should receive word, Matt. 2, 13, and they did stay there until after the death of Herod, Matt. 2, 15. The conclusion seems safe, then, that the death of Herod did not take place in the same year in which Jesus was born, especially since he himself allowed a possible total of two years between the time of the birth of the Child and the time when he slew the children of Bethlehem.

To these facts, deduced from the Bible, we may add certain others from fairly reliable historical sources. In the first place, Herod the Great died thirty-seven years after he was made king of Judea and the other Palestinian provinces, at the beginning of April in the year 750 a. u. c., or shortly after the eclipse of March 12, 750. In the second place, about the year 746 a. u. c. Herod fell into disgrace with Augustus, a fact which made certain

embassies from him to the Roman court necessary. (Cp. Josephus, *Antiquities,* XVI, 9, 3.) This fact must be kept in mind also in connection with the next point.

We have next to consider the matter of the census, of which Luke writes: "And it came to pass in those days that a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." Luke 2, 1. 2. The two difficulties here encountered are those pertaining to Cyrenius, or Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, and the census itself. It has been known since 1764 that Quirinius was governor of Syria from 6 to 9 A. D. But it has more recently been established that, whereas Sentius Saturninus was civil governor of Syria from 9 to 7 B. C., to be followed by Quinctilius Varus, yet Quirinius was military legate, not only of Syria, but also of Cilicia and other provinces in the Taurus region of Asia Minor, the date 10 to 7 B. C. having been definitely established in this connection. (Cp. *American Journal of Archeology,* IV, 1924, 436.) He was evidently in charge of the armies of the East, chiefly in conducting the war against the Homonadenses, but also in acting as the special lieutenant of the emperor in the affairs of Syria and the neighboring provinces. (Cp. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?* chap. XI; Robertson, *Luke the Historian,* 128.)

But how about the census itself? It was generally alleged that Luke had made a mistake in speaking of an enrolment by households which extended throughout the Roman Empire. But the facts are that we now have incontrovertible evidence of a periodic census in the Roman Empire beginning with the time of Augustus, the period being fourteen years. In an edict by Gaius Vibius Maximus, governor of Egypt, 104, A. D., we read: "The enrolment by households being at hand, it is necessary to notify all who for any cause are outside their homes to return to their domestic hearths, that they may accomplish the customary dispensation of enrolment and continue steadfastly in the husbandry that belongeth to them." (Robertson, *Luke the Historian,* 125 f.; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten,* 4. Aufl., 231 f.) Deissmann, who is certainly not too conservative in his evaluation of Bible material, says at this point: "Es handelt sich um eine der alle vierzehn Jahre stattfindenden Volkszaehlungen zum Zwecke der Feststellung der Kopfsteuer oder sonstiger personaler Verpflichtungen." It has been proved that an enrolment was made in the year 90 A. D., also one at the time of Nero in 61—62 A. D., extending a year or two beyond. A fragment found by Grenfell and Hunt, dated the

sixth year of Tiberius, 20 A. D., shows conclusively that periodic enrolments were in use at that time. A papyrus has also been discovered ordering an enrolment in Egypt 23 to 22 B. C. (Cp. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?* chap. VII.)

If we, now, add to this material the evidence found in Luke's writings, we find that he refers to a census in Acts 5, 37, at about the time when Archelaus had been deposed from his position as king, or ethnarch, of Judea and Samaria, and the so-called first general enrolment, of Luke 2, 1, the former being the census of 6 A. D., the latter that of 9 to 8 B. C.

But there is still some other material which cannot be disregarded at this point. We know that John the Baptist was approximately six months older than Jesus. But we read of him in Luke 3, 1. 2: "Now, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness." Since Tiberius was coregent of Augustus from 11—12 A. D. till 14 A. D., it follows that the fifteenth year of this emperor would be 26—27 A. D. Shortly afterward we are told that Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, Luke 3, 23, the *ὡσεί* of the Greek expressing about what our phrase "He was in His early thirties" would state. An additional tag is found in John 2, 20, which refers to about the same time in the public ministry of Jesus, His first Passover, shortly after He had begun to preach in public. The Jews there remark: "Forty and six years was this Temple in building." Since the Temple of Herod was begun in 20—19 B. C., this fact would again make the date 26—27 A. D.

The situation, then, comes down to this. The *terminus a quo* is the year 9—8 B. C., when Augustus actually sent out the decree commanding an enrolment throughout the empire, and the *terminus ad quem* is the year 4 B. C., the year of Herod's death. That we must go beyond the latter date a matter of some two or more years seems to follow from the various factors enumerated above. But that we cannot go all the way back to 8 B. C. in fixing the date of Christ's birth is also apparent from a number of points. In the first place, the decree could reach the territory under Herod's jurisdiction only via the legate of Syria, who transmitted it to the *rex socius,* this being the standing of Herod in the Roman

Empire. The sending of messengers bearing a copy of the decree naturally consumed much more time than a similar transaction would occupy to-day. After Herod had received the text of the document at Jerusalem by way of Antioch, there was still some delay. As Ramsay points out (*Was Christ Born in Bethlehem?* chap. IX), his conclusions being based partly upon Josephus and partly upon other sources, Herod at this time sent two embassies to the court of the emperor, for he was not at all willing to accept the census, a mark of servitude and degradation in rank, without some form of protest. When his petition went unheeded the first time, he sent a second embassy announcing his compliance with the emperor's wishes. All this, of course, took time, very likely more than a year. The year 8—7 B. C., which ended with April 17, 7 B. C., may practically be eliminated in our discussion. The only thing that remains is for us to conclude that the year 7 B. C. itself is the year during which the enrolment in Palestine was carried out, and if we desire to abide by the result of the search instituted in the fourth century, we could accept December 25 of that year as the date of Christ's birth.

It would follow from this, interestingly enough, that Jesus was fully thirty-three years old when He entered upon the work of His public ministry, early in 27 A. D., that He died at Easter-time in the year 31, when He was fully thirty-six years old, and that the formal establishment of the Christian Church took place on Pentecost Day of that year.

Masonry in the Garb of Christianity.

Prof. O. C. A. Boecler, St. Louis, Mo.

(Concluded.)

Mackey (*Encyclopedia,* Article "Prince of Mercy") says: "The twenty-sixth degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite is also called the Scottish Trinitarian." And why is it designated by this term of Christian theology? Mackey enlightens us by saying: "It is a Christian degree in its construction and treats of the triple covenant of mercy which God made with man — first with Abraham by circumcision; next with the Israelites in the wilderness, by the intermediation of Moses; and lastly, with all mankind, by the death and sufferings of Jesus Christ. It is in allusion to these three acts of mercy that the degree derives its two names of Scottish Trinitarian and Prince of Mercy." Because

of its "construction" and "allusion" it is called the Trinitarian degree. The dogma of the Trinity is not set forth for the acceptance of the candidate, for Mackey says: "But the real dogma of the degree is the importance of truth." It appears to be Christian, for in the presence of the initiate the Most Excellent reads: "Jesus of Nazareth, born of a virgin without sin, was chaste and holy. He descended into hell, He arose again and ascended to heaven, He charged His disciples to teach His pure doctrines, and gave them the gift of miracles. He will appear again at the end of the world, and a new creation and a new age of innocence shall commence." (Cp. *Scotch Rite Masonry, Illustrated,* J. Blanchard.) According to this same *exposé* by Blanchard the officer mentioned reads the following texts in the presence of the candidate: Gen. 49, 10; Is. 9, 6; John 1, 14; he reminds him of the threefold covenant mentioned by Mackey; and finally, taking water, he pours a small quantity of water on the candidate's head and says: "I pour this water on thy head as a symbol of the purification of the soul by suffering and sorrow, by which parting with the stains of sin and the sordidness of vice it becomes fit to return to its eternal home in the bosom of the Father, who loveth all the children He hath made." This degree, then, should be Christian in construction, when, as we have learned, the doctrine of the immaculate Virgin is taught, the "virgin without sin [?]"; and here the doctrine of salvation by works, besides a parody on Baptism, is enacted. Neither has this degree the semblance of a right to be called a Trinitarian degree; for even though the Father and the Son are mentioned, neither the name nor the work of the Holy Ghost is even faintly hinted at. Blanchard quotes these words from the ritual: "God is three and one, for His essence illuminates, warms, and makes fruitful at once"; and again we see how Masonry, in a very clumsy manner, seeks to imitate Christian doctrine and to pervert it. Even though it is called the Trinitarian degree and the Delta is used as a symbol, the candidate takes the oath "in the presence of the Great Architect of the Universe."

The Knights Templar degree, the twelfth of the American Rite, — not York Rite, for Mackey calls this a misnomer, — is usually called the Christian degree, and the Knights Templars make a great display of Christian trappings. But Mackey, who offers three columns of discussion regarding a quarrel among the Templars concerning the uniform to be worn and almost five more columns on the correct plural of Knight Templar, whether Knights

Templars or Knights Templar, does not feature this degree as a Christian one either in design or construction. From Simon's *Book of the Commandery,* p. 29 ff., we learn that numerous texts from Holy Writ are read during the ceremonies; among them are: Jas. 1, 1—10. 26. 27; Matt. 11, 28; 1 Pet. 2, 21; Col. 2, 8; Matt. 26, 14—25. 36—50; 27, 24—37; also a compilation of the story of Christ's resurrection and ascension. From this same source we learn, p. 38, that during the initiation the Knights sing the following hymn: —

The rising God forsakes the tomb,
Up to His Father's court He flies.
Cherubic legions guard Him home
And shout Him welcome to the skies.

Break off your tears, ye saints, and tell
How high our great Deliv'rer reigns;
Sing how He spoiled the hosts of hell
And led the monster Death in chains.

Say, Live forever, wondrous King,
Born to redeem and strong to save;
Then ask the tyrant, Where's thy sting?
And where's thy vict'ry, boasting grave?

Morris' Dictionary (Article "Jesus Christ") tells us: "The birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of this exalted personage constitute the sublime lessons of the Knights Templar order, which is emphatically the Christian branch of Masonry. The passages from the gospels that describe His Passion are read during the ceremonies." According to *Revised Knight Templarism, Illustrated* (Ezra A. Cook, publisher), the candidate for initiation is assured that the order with which he now seeks to unite is founded upon the Christian religion, and he is required to promise and vow to use his sword in the defense of the Christian religion and comforted with the thought that the Almighty will be his Strength and Salvation now and forever. He is warned that he who violates his vow is worthy of no better fate than that which Judas suffered, and is asked, "Does your conscience upbraid you for any known or overt act unrepented of?" and is admonished to remember that he will be called to render an account to that Supreme Judge from whom not even the most minute act of his life is hidden; he is also instructed that he must observe a term of penance, all men having erred, and error needing repentance, and therefore he is being offered a coarse diet and rough habit, and severe duties are imposed on him. The candidate is told: "Pilgrim, the scene

before you represents the conclusion of the hallowed sacrifice offered by the Redeemer of the world to propitiate the anger of an offended Deity"; and partaking of the Fifth Libation, in drinking wine from a human skull, he must repeat the words: "This pure wine I now take in testimony of my belief in the mortality of the body and the immortality of the soul; and as the sins of the whole world were once visited upon the head of our Savior, so may all the sins of the person whose skull this once was, in addition to my own, be heaped upon my head, and may this libation appear in the Judgment against me, both here and hereafter, should I ever knowingly or wilfully violate this most solemn vow of a Knight Templar. So help me God and keep me steadfast!" Thus the initiate hears the name of Jesus, listens to portions of the story of His holy Passion read in his presence, and is told that Jesus, by His death, propitiated the anger of an offended Deity, but he is never urged, on the pain of losing his immortal soul, to embrace that Savior by faith; on the contrary, he is instructed that the black cross which the Prelate, the official chaplain of the order, suspends from his neck "is also an emblem of our order, which you will wear as a constant memorial for you to imitate the virtues of that immaculate Jesus." Aye, even in His suffering and death, Jesus is held up to the candidate as an example only; for he hears: "You are now, as a trial of your faith and humility, performing a penance. Of this our Lord and Savior has left us a bright example; for although He was the eternal Son of God, He humbled Himself . . . to endure the pains and afflictions incident to human nature and finally to suffer a cruel and ignominious death upon the cross." And the usual Masonic reward for a truly Masonic life is held out to the candidate in this degree; for the Eminent Commander, holding a skull in his hands, addresses him thus: "Then let us improve the short space allotted to us, that, when our weak and frail bodies, like this memento, shall be reduced to sepulchral dust and ashes, our disembodied spirits may soar aloft to that blessed region where dwells light and life eternal." At the very conclusion of his initiation the newly dubbed Knight hears from the lips of the same official as he hands him a metal star: "Wear this star as the emblem of the reward which the Great Captain of our salvation has promised to those who conquer in His name." The lengthy and tedious ceremonies of this Knights Templar degree are very much like a pompous pontifical Mass and a strange jumble of Scripture-passages, Scriptural historical facts, seeming truths, and

naked lies of the devil. Masonry, especially in this degree, is as strong a delusion as popery is. This is heathenism pure and simple, practised in the name of "the Sovereign Architect of the Universe," in whose presence the candidate has taken the oath upon his soul, binding himself "under no less penalty than that of having my head smote off and placed on the highest spire of Christendom." We might add here that Rebold, in his *History of Freemasonry,* p. 348, says this concerning the prescribed prayer the Prelate uses: "In this prayer [prescribed in the charter of York] we perceive no mention made of a Trinity, the Deity invoked being none other than the Great Architect of the Universe, that Great First Cause recognized by the Noachidean doctrine, and the belief in the eternal existence of which can readily be concurred in by men of every confession."

In the light of what has now been learned about the character of the Knights Templar degree, we are better able to form a correct opinion of the customary Easter service of this order.

Masonry is tolerant. Tolerance is its badge of honor, we are assured time and again. Masonry leaves "the minds of its disciples on all sectarian points perfectly untrammeled." And Mackey (*Lexicon,* Article "Religion") continues: "The religion of Masonry is pure theism, on which its different members engraft their own peculiar opinions; but they are not permitted to introduce them into the lodge or to connect their truth or falsehood with the truth of Masonry." When Knights Templars, therefore, choose a Baptist Church for their religious devotions on Easter Sunday and a fundamentalist pastor as their speaker, they are at liberty to do so. But if one of the infidel preachers of to-day is their selection, they are still good Masons. They may believe that "the sins of the whole world were once visited upon the head of our Savior," or they may refuse to believe this and maintain that Jesus, by His life, suffering, and death, merely set an example for our imitation. Masonry as such considers these "sectarian doctrines" of no import. They may or may not recite the tenet of the Apostles' Creed: "He descended into hell." They may, as loyal Masons, choose nothing but hymns of a distinctly Christian character for their Easter programs, but they may also content themselves with singing the song of patriotism: "My Country, 'Tis of Thee." If Sir John Bowring, a widely known English Unitarian, could compose "In the Cross of Christ I Glory" (No. 95 in our hymn-book) and "God Is Love; His Mercy Brightens" (No. 510 in our hymn-book) and mean and sing them in a Unitarian sense, why should not

Masons be able to sing Christian hymns in a Masonic way, in the spirit of Masonic theism? "Words are often forced to commit suicide." Masonry is the bedfellow of modern infidel theology, as we may infer from these words of the *National Trestle Board* (a Masonic magazine) of February, 1924: "It is the Modernist, whether of the churches or fraternity, who has sensed the call of the time and is making effort to answer thereto." Masonry is the hotbed of syncretism, egregious compromise in religion, and the baldest kind of indifferentism, arrogantly parading, at sundry times, in the tawdry uniform of pretended Christianity.

The oath and what it contains is the only confession of faith and of doctrine which the candidate is obliged to accept, and this oath is never administered in the name of the Triune God or of Jesus, but always in the name of Almighty God, the most high God, God, our heavenly Father, the Holy One of Israel, the Great Architect of the Universe, the Supreme Architect of the Universe, the Grand Architect of the Universe, or the Sovereign Architect of the Universe, whether it be in degrees one to thirteen of the American Rite or in the first to the thirty-third degree of the Scottish Rite. And when a member of Knights Templarism or a member of Scottish Rite Masonry of the thirty-second degree chooses to enter the ranks of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine, he adopts "the Arab's creed," takes his oath on the "Bible and on the mysterious legend of the Koran," and prays: "May Allah, the God of Arab, Moslem, and Mohammedan, the God of our fathers, support unto the entire fulfilment of the same. Amen, Amen, Amen." (Compare the *Mystic Shrine, Illustrated;* Ezra A. Cook, publisher.) So, then, the god of a full-fledged Knight Templar, the declared exponent of the Christian religion, the god of the Scottish Rite Mason, who is satisfied with a few degrees which are said to be Christian in design, construction, or allusion, the god of the Mystic Shrine, who teaches his votaries that "those who die in the faith will be resurrected in glory," is any kind of god, as long as the word god is uttered, whether it be the sun, the first cause, the creative principle, the generative principle, or a supreme intelligence, generally mentioned as "the Great Architect of the Universe."

Lux e tenebris, Mackey informs us in his *Encyclopedia,* p. 479, is "very commonly used as a motto in the caption of Masonic documents as expressive of the object of Masonry, . . . and has a recondite meaning." He illumines us farther on: "So *lux* being

truth, or Masonry, and *tenebrae,* or darkness, the symbol of initiation, *lux e tenebris* is Masonic truth proceeding from initiation." We agree with him that darkness is a fitting symbol for Masonic initiation. But light can never grow out of darkness, except by a divine fiat or the workings of the Spirit of God. Like always produces like, and so Masonry, by initiation, leads its votaries, degree by degree, from darkness to darkness, into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. The Triune God alone is Light, and He has manifested Himself only in Christ and exerts His light- and life-giving powers through the Holy Ghost and by His means of grace, that man may possess spiritual, heavenly, and eternal light by faith in Christ Jesus.

The Bible and the Sins of the Saints.

Rev. J. Hoeness, Grand Haven, Mich.

(Concluded.)

Indeed, the narrations of the transgressions of the saints illustrate the truth of these words of the psalmist (Ps. 5, 4): "Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness; neither shall evil dwell with Thee." They reveal to us the corruption of human nature and demonstrate that even the holiest and most highly favored men of God are still tempted by their sinful flesh and are liable to fall into the most deplorable sins if they are not constantly on their guard, do not use the Word of God as a weapon and guide, fail to pray unceasingly and to flee the temptations to evil. These transgressions also make it clear to us that no one in this present life will arrive at a stage of sanctification where he can truly say, I have reached perfection; I am safe now and no longer in need of the forgiveness of sins, no longer in need of a Savior from sin. A prating and boasting enthusiast may do this; but a prayerful contemplation of those Biblical stories would teach him that, in order to attain to the true enjoyment of the salvation wrought by Christ, it is necessary for him, above all, to repent of his blasphemous pride and vaunting in sackcloth and ashes. In a solemn and impressive manner the sins of the saints are held up to us as in a mirror, in which we are to behold our own image; and a close examination of ourselves before this mirror will disclose to us the undeniable fact that, even if heretofore we have, by the grace of God, been kept from the grossest outbreaks of sin, we nevertheless have sinned often in a similar, though more refined way,

that all the sins and crimes which those men in the Bible became guilty of, are dormant in us, in every man's heart, and that sometimes only a spark from outside is needed to cause us to commit the most horrible sins. Indeed, "Scripture hath concluded all under sin that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. 3, 22. Moreover, while these narratives show the necessity and need of a Savior for every one, whether saint or sinner, they also constitute the most forceful, the most emphatic, and the most impressive words of warning against sin ever written by pen or ever uttered by the tongue of man. We know that men like Noah, David, and Peter repented of their sins and were pardoned by the Lord; they were not cut off from the people of God forever, and every true believer is assured that he will meet them in heaven, in the true land of the living. But look at the temporal consequences of their transgressions and remember how severely God, as a true Father, chastised them to deter them from future infringements upon his holy Law, as well as to warn others. For instance, through what agony of soul did not David and Peter have to go before they came to the full assurance of the forgiveness of their sins! Scripture and experience teach us that the memory of their sins comes back to men and ever harasses them again, even after they have been assured of the remission of their sins; for which reason David, even when in a state of grace, prays, Ps. 27, 5: "Remember not the sins of my youth nor my transgressions; according to Thy mercy remember Thou me for Thy goodness' sake, O Lord." And how heavy did the hand of the Lord lie upon these men by all kinds of external and temporal misfortunes in order to discipline and correct them! What a gloom did the sin of Noah cast over his whole remaining lifetime we pointed out before. Could there be a more bitter disappointment than that which Moses experienced when he was told by the Lord that on account of his unbelief he must not enter the Land of Promise, but was doomed to die at the very border of it? What a host of plagues fell upon David and his house because in the hour of temptation he had forsaken the Lord's commandments and given great offense to Israel and to the enemies of the Lord! How bitter were Peter's tears after his denial, how great his grief and sorrow, so that he needed special and repeated consolations from the lips of the risen Savior to quiet and overcome his agonizing doubts and fears and to restore to him the joy of his heart and his peace with God. The way of the transgressor is hard, even if the transgression is followed by true, genuine repentance. In the

light of these and similar considerations we are constrained to say that the man who sees in the narrations of the sins of the saints an encouragement and inducement to commit the same sins either does not know what he is speaking of, having only the most superficial knowledge of these Bible-stories, or he has set himself purposely and deliberately against the truth, totally ignoring and suppressing the voice of his own conscience. On the other hand, whosoever tries at least to set aside his prejudices and reads these stories carefully will soon admit, even if he may still be unconverted, that they contain the strongest warning possible against sin and crime, and he cannot altogether shut his eyes against the evident fact that a book which speaks in such a manner of the sins of its great men and heroes of faith, a book which discusses their sins so thoroughly with respect to their origin, their performance, and their fatal consequences, without showing any partiality and bias, must come from a better source than other books, in other words, that it must come from God Himself, that God who said when He gave the Ten Commandments: "I, the Lord, thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me." And as to us, who, enlightened by the Holy Ghost, believe the Word of God, every renewed and repeated perusal of these passages confirms and strengthens the conviction in us that *all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is truly profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. 2 Tim. 3, 16.

III.

People who are scandalized at the account which Scripture gives of the sins of the saints also ignore and misjudge the main purpose of Holy Scripture. This purpose is to offer to sinful and mortal man, doomed to eternal perdition as he is by nature, the sweetest, the most precious comfort, the comfort of which he stands in need more sorely than of his daily bread, namely, the solace and assurance of pardon, of the remission of sins, and of life eternal. Holy Scripture states this purpose in various words. Ps. 119, 104: "Through Thy precepts I get understanding." Ps. 19, 8: "The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart, the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." St. Paul says of Scripture that it maketh wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. His fellow-apostle Peter calls it a light that shineth in a dark place, until the Day-star arise in

our hearts. In order, however, that nobody might take exception to the passages under discussion, the Apostle Paul, after having dwelt at length on the sins and rebellious acts of the Israelites in the wilderness, writes Rom. 15, 4: "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." The comfort we are to obtain from the account of the sins of the people of God — whether committed collectively or individually — is the comfort of the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake. For not only Peter knew that there is no salvation, no grace, no pardoning of sin, no hope of eternal life, without Christ, but also the people of God in the Old Testament were aware of the fact that their "salvation," forgiveness of sins, hope of a blessed life in the world to come, is based upon the Woman's Seed, the future Messiah, and His work of redemption. This even the Gospel primeval shows, likewise the words of Eve at the birth of her first-born and the name which Lamech, the father of Noah, gave to his son, though both Eve and Lamech were mistaken as to the person. This comfort, then, which every man needs in order to escape the wrath to come, is also offered and imparted to the terrified and contrite sinner in these narratives either directly or indirectly. Of course, the selfsame priceless comfort is offered to the sinner in a multitude of other passages, plain, unmistakable, but nevertheless powerful and efficacious statements of the grace of a reconciled God and Father in heaven. But, alas! the human heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; if the conscience is frightened by the thunders from Mount Sinai, if Satan shoots his fiery darts into the heart of the terrified transgressor, it is sometimes exceedingly hard even for one who has a fair and even profound knowledge of the Good Book, to lay a firm hold on these promises. The troubled heart will object and say: Yes, I know God is gracious; I know what He says in Ps. 32, 1, Ezek. 33, 11, Is. 1, 18, 1 John 1, 7, etc. But my sin is too terrible, my transgressions are too numerous; these words are for such as are not loaded down with a guilt like mine, but they are not meant for me. Even men of a strong faith may be troubled thus, and not even because of gross offenses and misdeeds, but at the recollection of sins which seem to be insignificant in the eyes of men. One such sin may terrify them to such an extent that the whole wide world seems too narrow for them. But in those Bible stories men are placed before our eyes who committed great and dreadful sins and lost the grace of God and made shipwreck of their faith, but who, upon

repenting, received the divine assurance of the forgiveness of their sins, also of most shocking transgressions, and thereupon rejoiced again in the Lord and His salvation. Think of the penitential psalms and of Peter. In one respect these men were the greatest of all sinners. These selfsame men had even before their fall received more abundant grace than the average believer, more knowledge, more light and understanding, more strength to overcome temptations, more opportunities and gifts of the Spirit to build the kingdom of God. Theirs was the greater responsibility. Christ says, Luke 12, 48: "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Their fall was therefore the more grievous and inexcusable and the harm they did to the Church and her great cause the more detrimental. If we, then, read in the Bible that these men were received again into the grace and favor of the Lord and that, after they had risen from their fall, God was pleased to use them again for building the walls of Zion, it cannot be gainsaid that these Bible stories, so often criticized, laughed at, misconstrued, and made the targets of foul jests, are in reality the most effective and powerful Gospel-messages, showing that also the greatest sinners, even adulterers, murderers, blasphemers, are not barred from the pardoning grace of God, not shut out from the gates of the heavenly Jerusalem, if they but truly repent. Experienced pastors are able to tell us that in not a few instances where the troubled and conscience-stricken sinners would not be comforted by other passages of the Bible, the application of these Bible stories has restored peace to the sinners' heart, silenced the harassing accusations of their conscience and the threats of the Law, and filled their souls anew with the joyous hope of eternal life. Even unbelievers have sometimes an opportunity to see and perceive this, for example, in the case of criminals who repent before their execution and meet death with composure, yea, even with joy, because such examples of Holy Writ as David, Peter, and the thief on the cross give them abundant comfort and the certain hope of life everlasting.

Such comfort and hope human wisdom and human works cannot impart. Natural man knows nothing of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. Human wisdom leaves the sinner in despair, as the high priests did with regard to the traitor Judas Iscariot, or gives him the advice to reconcile an angry God and to appease a terrified conscience by his own efforts, especially penances, without ever being able to tell him whether he has done enough. But man is unable to expiate even one sin, no matter what sacrifice

he may bring. "Miserable comforters are ye all," this word of Job, Job 16, 2, applies to all who use man's wisdom to comfort the sinner. But if the Bible, especially the narratives of which we speak in this essay, gives to the sinner knowledge, comfort, and consolation, which all philosophical systems are unable to offer, — no religion outside the Christian faith, none of the otherwise beautiful myths of Hellas, not the entrancing tales and sagas of the Northern world, because they are totally ignorant of God's plan of the salvation of a sinful world, — how can any man be so presumptuous and overbold as to claim that on account of the narratives of the sins of Noah, David, Peter, and others the Bible cannot be the Word of the Most High. Just the opposite is true. The sins of the saints as recorded in the Bible are one of the many evidences of the divine origin of the Bible. The message of boundless grace proclaimed to some of the worst sinners on earth for the sake of Christ cannot be the product of a human genius, cannot be of human invention. If you read the masterworks of classical literature, they will tell you much of human guilt and human expiations. If these Biblical stories are nevertheless a poison and an offense to the ungodly and self-righteous, it is because in their pharisaic pride they do not want to be rebuked or do not wish to be disturbed in the enjoyment of their carnal lusts, loving darkness more than light. When the Church Father Augustine was still a young man, a skeptic and given to debauchery, he one day heard from an adjoining room the voice of a child repeating the words: *"Tolle, lege"* (Take and read). These simple words made the deepest impression upon him. He began to read the New Testament carefully and found the precious pearl, which is better than all the wisdom of the wise and infinitely more valuable than all the treasures of this perishable world. Oh, that all those who object to the Bible as the inspired Word of God would, like Augustine, heed this voice, *"Tolle, lege,"* echoing through many centuries since the days of Augustine, yea, rather since the day when the first book of the Bible was completed! Oh, that all would lay aside their foolish prejudices, carefully read the Bible, and thoughtfully study the narratives at which they take particular offense! Then the grace of God would also enlighten them, and the selfsame Bible stories which formerly they were scandalized at and which were used by them as an argument against the Bible, to deepen the blindness of the blind, would prove to them a power of salvation. They would finally be led to see the heavenly wisdom and comfort exhibited and offered in them and with all true Christians

thank God for the Bible, also for the narratives in which the sins of the saints are recorded, as the most precious and most valuable gift to sinful man. God grant that we all may rely on the grace which Noah, Moses, David, and the thief on the cross received and enjoyed and take comfort in it in life and death! Then all will be well in time and eternity.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Rome is just now playing the game of church union with zest. Besides planning for its own World Congress at Rome in 1930, it is looking wistfully towards Russia and watching England. Says the *Commonweal* (October 21): "Out of the welter of confusion in the Russian Church strange gleams break, that are alternately bright with promise and lurid with the threat of further trouble to come. Dispatches last week tell of the virtual failure of the Church Congress held at Moscow to raise any kind of standard around which bishops and clergy might rally to the defense of whatever deposit of religion has survived the laicizing policy of the Soviets. On the contrary, the rift between those who are tiring of strife and those who still believe that essentials of religion forbid any sort of compromise with the civil power seems to be widening. 'At the present moment,' says Mr. Duranty, the very wide-awake correspondent of the *New York Times* in Russia, 'the confusion in the Russian Church is such that, for the first time in a thousand years, there is a possibility of the reunion of the Eastern (Greek) and the Western (Roman Catholic) branches of the Church.' It would be easy for Catholics to exaggerate a prospect that so appeals to their imagination, where the wish is so apt to be father to the thought. Strong Erastian influences are at work to combat the prospect of reunion held out by Bishop Vedenski, the Metropolitan of Moscow. Bishop Makary, of Peterhof, goes so far as to call for public prayer for a government 'now definitely established by the will of the majority of the Russian people,' while the reactionary partisans of the late Archbishop Tikhon, though keeping in the background, for reasons that are not hard to understand, are by no means idle, and their views almost certainly do not include reunion with Rome. Among the many recent incidents which seem to show a growing disposition to seek salvation by a healing of the ancient breach between East and West, perhaps one of the most hopeful is the recent conversion of Dr. Philip Morozow, archimandrite of Wilno, Poland, and rector of the 'orthodox' seminary there. In a dispatch sent by mail and recently published in the Canadian Catholic press, a letter addressed to the faculty and students whom he is leaving is quoted. It gives some idea of how frail is the barrier that stands between the two great branches of the ancient Church, and how natural, in a generation

or two, would seem a gesture that swept it away. 'In taking leave of you,' says Dr. Morozow, 'I beg you to believe that I do not betray anything that should be dear to you — true faith and attachment to our nation. In becoming a son of the Catholic Church, I remain faithful to the orthodoxy which saints and doctors of the one and indivisible Church have confessed. I repudiate no true "dogma" of this orthodoxy. I am not asked to renounce our ancient rite in the tongue of the Slavic apostles, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, a rite and tongue recognized and approved by Rome, side by side with the Latin rite. A recognition of the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff in no way hinders me from considering myself a faithful son of our beloved Russian nation. . . .' In the face of such a declaration a certain hollowness in the much be-paragraphed flirting with Canterbury and Lambeth during the summer inevitably suggests itself." The writer is correct: there has never been any great reason why the Eastern and Western hierarchies should not be one. The schism that divided them was only nominally on doctrinal grounds; it was chiefly caused by political interests. The *Filioque* will not prevent the union, now that Rome's ecclesiastical imperialism considers union desirable and opportune. And even the blasphemous Soviets will be swallowed in order that this union may be achieved.

DAU.

A number of inquiries have come to me regarding the copy of the Augsburg Confession that has been discovered in the museum at Nuremberg and which an Associated Press report represented as the original document given to Emperor Charles V. To all these inquiries I would say that the little piece of news which the press published is insufficient for determining the character of the document said to have been found. Until the document is published or an adequate description is given, I must continue to believe that the original of the Augsburg Confession does not exist, neither the Latin nor the German. DAU.

Critical reviews of the Ecumenical Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm during August are filling the church-papers. Here are the impressions gathered by one who happened to be in Sweden and Norway at the time (Dr. Kropatschek, of Dresden?): "We had abundant opportunities to hear and read individual opinions and newspaper verdicts on the Conference. Many persons, even such as were well disposed towards the conference, share the view expressed by Professor Reu in his *Kirchliche Zeitschrift:* 'The Conference will soar skyward like a blazing rocket and share its fate in the end.' Again and again faithful Lutherans and Christians from *Gemeinschaft* circles spoke to us about 'the great spectacle,' 'the grand parade,' etc. It is a shocking fact that the people are about to lose confidence in certain leaders who are championing the Stockholm venture. Spite of all their soothing assurances the people fail to understand them. Nothing can characterize the artificial make-up of the Congress better than the fact that throughout the *three* Nordic countries, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, the *active, believing, self-sacrificing* church people will have nothing to do with the

Congress, or, to say the least, treat it with a great deal of mistrust. In *Norway,* for instance, great excitement was caused by the announcement that Bishop *Gleditsch,* the only liberal bishop, is to represent Norway on the permanent Executive Board of the Congress. The leading devotional paper *For fattigen og rike* ("For Poor and Rich"), which has more than 30,000 subscribers, sharply declined to have anything to do with the Stockholm meeting and violently attacked Archbishop Soederblom because he does not accept the Second Article [of the Apostles' Creed]. In *Sweden* there continues to appear sharp criticism of the meeting in *Goeteborgs Stiftszeitung.* In *Denmark* the well-known Pastor *Skovgaard Petersen,* who was in Stockholm, gives vent to his disappointment in *Kristelig Dagblad.* Meanwhile a lively discussion is going on in the Nordic press of a plan of the Pope that has not yet been made known in Germany, *viz.,* to summon a WORLD CONGRESS of all churches to ROME in 1930, that is, in the quadricentenary year of the Augsburg Confession. The Roman Bishop *J. Mueller,* who is making an inspection tour of Sweden, in plain terms confirms the report of this plan and points to it as evidence that the Catholic Church honestly desires unity. But, he says, the *question of unity* is not a burning one for the Roman Church because she already has unity. He regards the question as a more critical one for *Protestants:* they must *first become united among themselves* before Rome can enter into union with them. The *Goeteborg Stiftszeitung* dryly comments: 'We believe the Roman Bishop is right. For a "united" Protestantism the way to Rome is not far!' It is well known that Catholics hold no heresy ought to last longer than four hundred years! Hence their plan for 1930! What may be the reason why in GERMANY there is nobody so far who talks about this plan of the Pope? Has there not been something like shame aroused in Germany over this 'Church Conference' at Stockholm, which so strongly emphasized the fact that the absence of Rome was the only 'dark spot' in the enterprise?— However, the German press has been the more zealous in publishing another fact, regarding which the entire Swedish press and possibly the entire foreign press has observed a significant silence: after the close of the Conference the German delegation through President *Dr. Kapler,* submitted a written statement regarding the question, WHO CAUSED THE WAR? [Understand, not the lie about who caused the war!] *While the Conference was in session,* this question was kept in abeyance in the interest of unity and peace. After the close of the Conference the Committee on Continuation was to take action upon the question. However, the President of the Conference, *Archbishop Soederblom,* who well knew how to make excellent use of the Swedish press in other respects, *did not give it* this bitter piece of news after the close of the Conference. The doughty *Goeteborg Stiftszeitung* has established this fact. The German delegates seem to have quietly pocketed this affront and are in fulsome terms talking about their achievement of getting into personal touch with, etc., etc. Moreover, when the German delegates made a very tame statement of their attitude towards the League of Nations,

a *Danish* delegate called that a 'tactless act,' and the Germans seem disposed to ignore this affront too. We have reported these facts because they confirm our opinion of the Stockholm Conference. . . . We fear that confusion will be created also in Lutheran circles by very skilfully prepared reports about this Conference." DAU.

The entire October issue of the "Christian Union Quarterly," 130 pages, is devoted to the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work. Until the complete protocol of that meeting is published, this number of the *Christian Union Quarterly* offers the best source of information regarding the inwardness of the Conference, its spirit, thought, and aspirations. On one of the first pages the editor has set off by itself and in special print one remark which he calls "the cementing prayer." It was made in an address by Wilfred Monod, of Paris, France, and is as follows: "In order to obtain this important result, there is no necessity of revising our creeds and our symbols. Christianity will never cease to contemplate, in adoration, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' But it should regard with increasing understanding the extent and the eagerness of the battle for the extermination of iniquity. Let, therefore, the Christian world meditate at the foot of the cross upon the prayer taught us by the Savior, the prayer which cements the different parts of the Christian edifice, the prayer which could even unite all the followers of all religions, all those who pray sincerely in the whole world ; for it contains not one single formula of Christian theology, but blossoms in its fulness on the religious and social plane of evangelic Messianic faith." The reader will place his own critical marks in the margin alongside this effusion, which subjects the glorious prayer taught by the Redeemer to a new martyrdom. Monod's appeal to the sin-bearing Lamb of God is nothing but a pious gesture, if he wants to unite "all the followers of all religions, all who pray sincerely" before the Atoning Sacrifice. Paul was conscious of the fact that the Gospel of this reconciliation roused the scorn and the fury of the world. Monod has forgotten that the Christ is "the sign that is spoken against," the rock on whom thousands are dashed to pieces.—The issue of the *Christian Union Quarterly* before us contains, besides the editor's notes on the Conference, the opening sermon from Matt. 4, 17, by the Lord Bishop of Winchester; Alfred E. Garvie's paper on "The Church's Obligation in View of God's Purpose for the World"; Arvid Runestam's paper on "The Essence of Christian Love"; Sir Willoughby Dickinson's paper on "The Work of International Friendship through the Churches"; Walter Simons's paper on "Christianity and Crime"; Selma Lagerloef's paper on "Unity between All Peoples"; William Adams Brown's paper on "The Church and Christian Education"; the closing sermon by the Archbishop of Uppsala; reports of commissions, and the final "Message" of the Conference. The only thing that becomes plain while one reads and tries to digest these deliverances is that in the opinion of the Conference any one may believe anything he pleases, but he must be considerate enough of the feelings of others to keep his beliefs strictly to himself and come and work with the others,

no matter if they treat his belief with contempt or pity. Although for a different reason, Christianity will have as much reason to remember Stockholm in 1925 as Nicaea in 325. DAU.

The recent Stockholm Conference had "excluded questions of creed and order and dealt with the duty of the Church toward practical problems of every-day life. Topics included were: 1. The Church's obligation in view of God's purpose for the world; 2. the Church and economic and industrial problems; 3. the Church and social and moral problems; 4. the Church on international relations; 5. the Church and Christian education; 6. methods of cooperative and federative efforts by the Christian communities." In other words, what would have been the distinct, legitimate, and urgent business of churchmen at such a gathering, the establishment of unity in the faith, was declared out of order at the Stockholm Conference. And many things that were not distinctly, nor legitimately, nor urgently the business of churchmen were made the order of the day at this meeting. What was achieved by the Conference in its chosen tasks? On the strength of reports which he has received from correspondents, John Martin Vincent, Professor of European History at Johns Hopkins, says: "As was inevitable in such an assembly, there was little unity of opinion on social and moral questions. If it was intended to formulate a social creed for modern churches, as the Council of Nicaea, 1,600 years ago, formulated a doctrinal creed, that end was not attained; for the divisions of sentiment upon prohibition, divorce, and other problems were acute. The reports of special commissions upon social issues were without impressive significance, hence there was no great treaty placed on record." (*Current History,* for September.) The blessing of the Head of the Church on this showy effort at Stockholm of divided members of the Church so far is not in evidence. The only tangible results of the meeting to date are: greater publicity for the Swedish archbishop — this result was thorough — and giddy heads for some Lutherans from America who attended that meeting. DAU.

Does the Fourth Gospel contain any reference to the virgin birth of our Lord? This question has induced Prof. A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Seminary at Louisville, to examine once more the evidence for reading, in John 1, 13: *ὃς ἐγεννήθη* for *οἳ ἐγεννήθησαν*. If the former reading is adopted, v. 13 connects with v. 14, not with v. 12: it describes the manner of the incarnation of the Logos, not the manner of the spiritual rebirth of believers. The textual evidence is altogether against the former reading: all Greek manuscripts have the plural instead of the singular variant. Nevertheless, liberal theologians like Harnack and Loisy, who do not themselves believe the virgin birth, argue for the singular in John 1, 13 because they hold that John certainly did believe it. Frederick Blass, the author of the *Grammar of New Testament Greek,* the great Zahn in his *Introduction to the New Testament,* and A. E. Brooke, in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible,* argue for the singular. The last-named writer says: "The singular well leads up to v. 14, and the connection with what precedes is good; the

sonship of Christians rests on His sonship. In particular the very emphatic threefold negative statement of v. 13 seems to be directed against some who affirmed the contrary, and such a denial was far more likely to be of Christ's supernatural conception than of the divine begetting of Christians in the spiritual sense." Hort, in his edition of the New Testament, has deemed the variant with the singular important enough by marking it "Western" in a special note. It is a fact that Irenaeus and Tertullian quote John 1, 13 in the singular reading: Irenaeus, in speaking of the incarnation, and Tertullian in arguments against the Valentinians and the Ebionites, who denied the virgin birth. Furthermore, Justin Martyr and Augustine apparently knew John 1, 13 in the singular reading. The earliest quotations of this verse give the singular, and this date is a hundred and fifty years earlier than *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, the two oldest Greek uncials. The last Old Latin *Codex Veronensis* (*b*) has *"qui natus est,"* while the Curatonian Syriac has the relative pronoun in the plural, but the verb in the singular. Robertson also calls attention to the fact that Hort holds "that there are some sixty-five cases in the New Testament where all the Greek manuscripts are wrong and where we have a primitive error," and that this is possibly the case in John 1, 13. He sums up the evidence thus: "With the light before us, we cannot insist that the singular is clearly, or even probably, the correct text. It is possibly correct. That is all one can say," — especially when one takes into consideration the picture of God in the flesh which John and Paul in their writings and in the oldest known document about Christ, the Logia, have drawn. DAU.

Professor Robertson has embodied some excellent personal testimonies in his article, which corroborate time-honored Christological truths. They will be valued by Lutherans all the more because of the source from which they have emanated. Here are some of them as published in the *Biblical Review* for October: "Both in John and in Paul the main problem is the incarnation of Christ, the Son of God. The Virgin Birth is a detail of the Incarnation. The real battle is over the Incarnation. Paul and John do not mean that God entered by spiritual impression into the heart and life of Jesus so that He became a God-filled man and was lifted into fellowship and communion with God. The rather, they both give us the picture of One who was already in existence before the Incarnation as the Son of God, who voluntarily came to earth to do His redemptive work for men. It is plain, without any reference to the Virgin Birth, that Paul and John set before us the conception of One who is more than a man, who lived as God's Son before He became the Son of Man, who remained God's Son while the Son of Man, and who to-day is both Son of God and Son of Man. He took back to heaven His humanity as He brought to earth His deity. He was both God and man on earth as He is now in heaven Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of Man." (p. 572f.) "The New Testament will be left a torso if the statements about the deity and the incarnation of Jesus Christ are all taken out. There is no getting rid of the

Incarnation without also getting rid of Christianity. Now, incarnation is absolutely supernatural. There is no possible way to explain it by any sort of ratiocination. If one is willing to admit and to believe in the fact of the Incarnation, he has no logical ground to stand on in any objection to the fact of the Virgin Birth. There is absolutely nothing in the New Testament that contradicts the Virgin Birth." (p. 573.) "If one does not believe in the Incarnation, it is probably useless to talk with him about the Virgin Birth. But it will be profitable for one who accepts the incarnation of Christ as a fact, to visualize to himself any process by which the Son of God, who already existed in heaven, came to earth. He will, I believe, have very great difficulty in formulating any theory that is more credible than the Virgin Birth narratives of Matthew and Luke." (p. 574.) "The author pointedly asserts that the preexistent Logos *σὰρξ ἐγένετο.* Note *ἐγένενο,* not *ἦν,* as in v. 1. Something happened to one already existing. John comes right up to the point of giving us the Virgin Birth. Is his language inconsistent with it? Absolutely not. It is in perfect harmony with it. In fact, one will have difficulty in giving full force to the language of v. 14 without the idea of the Virgin Birth. If Jesus already existed with the Father, as in 1, 1, how could He become (*ἐγένετο*) a man already begotten in the ordinary fashion, who was a complete personality? John's language, 'became flesh,' means clearly that somehow this Logos, who was God, was united with human nature." (p. 575.) "This idea of the peculiar origin of Jesus pervades the Gospel of John from beginning to end. It makes it practically certain that, when he wrote the words, 'The Logos became flesh,' he was referring to the virgin birth of Jesus, who then, as the Son of God, came into our human nature as the Son of Man. That being true, it is not a matter of great importance what the real text of John 1, 13 is. If the singular, *ὃς ἐγεννήθη,* should ever prove to be genuine, it would be discounted by those who reject the Virgin Birth as of no more value than John 1, 1. 14. 18. There the Incarnation stands out clearly." (p. 578f.) DAU.

The Stockholm World Conference, called by Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden on the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicaea to be a convention of world-wide Lutheranism, has left nothing but an aftertaste of weakness and confusion. Dr. Ernest Gordon writes in the *Sunday-school Times:* "A congress convened on the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicaea should proudly reaffirm the Nicaean faith. It should not welcome to its membership those who openly or tacitly disavow the faith. It is for this reason that Bishop Ihmels of Saxony declares that he has serious doubts about it, looks for little or nothing to come out of it, and takes part in it under mental protest. . . . Of evangelical conviction and missionary fire and Puritan determination there is blessed little in these August days in Stockholm." One of the chief objects of the meeting was to promote international peace; but any advantage in this direction was counterbalanced by the mixing of Church and State, and a general confusing of confessional lines. The editor of the

Lutheran Church Herald writes (October 27): "The continued repetition of 'understanding,' 'cooperation,' and that it is not necessary to agree in confession, will have its effect among the Lutherans. It will increase the indifference, so prevalent in our day, regarding the Word of God, lead to a denial of salvation by faith alone, and emphasize salvation by good works." Typical of the confessional laxity and gross unionism prevalent at the Conference was the spectacle — witnessed by Rev. J. C. K. Preus of the Norwegian Synod, who attended the Conference unofficially — of a Greek-Catholic requiem celebrated in the Lutheran Gustav Vasa Church on a Sunday evening. Lutherans in black gowns participated with English lord bishops in silver and white, patriarchs of the East, and the archbishop and metropolitan of Bukowina. The service was conducted in Russian, with magnificent chanting and a solemn ritual for the peace of soul of Patriarch Tikhon of Constantinople, whose death prevented his appearance at the Conference. In the above-mentioned issue Rev. Preus is quoted as saying: "All this took place in a Lutheran church, arranged for by a Lutheran archbishop. Such things will happen at an ecumenical church meeting where the fundamental principle is to *forget confessions* and to unite for practical purposes those *divided in spirit.*" MUELLER.

The Juvenile Literature Board of Synod has not been organized or done its work because of a whim, but in view of a real need. It is interesting to note how this need has been felt also in other circles. The *Sunday-school Times* of October 24, 1925, devotes an entire issue to children's books. One of the leading articles is written by the librarian in the public library of a large city, whose observations are illuminating. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that just those books which are recommended for juvenile reading often "ably supplement the efforts of the evolutionists and modernists in grounding the generation of the future in their false teachings." F. A. Kummer's *First Days of Man* admits in its preface that it "takes many liberties" to give "a story of the development of civilization which rests upon a *foundation of fact.*" The second volume, *First Days of Knowledge,* states that the idea of God has grown out of sun, moon, *and animal worship;* that "thinking men and women of to-day do not believe in the God of the Israelites because we cannot believe He would choose and defend one people nor be appeased by burnt offerings." *St. Nicholas' Magazine* is publishing Hillyer's *A Child's History of the World* as an "accurate outline of the progress of mankind from the barbaric caveman of thousands of years ago to the airman of to-day." Interesting is the criticism of "Boy Scout-approved" books on the ground of evolutionary teachings behind the mask of nature study and woodcraft. Elementary biographies of scientists are fostering evolutionary ideals. Of Louis Agassiz, F. Darrow writes: "It is difficult to understand how a man of his intelligence and extensive knowledge of the geological life of the past should have failed to recognize that evolution is simply the Creator's method of working." With the writer of the criticism we

subscribe to the one means of counteracting this poison: "Thorough instruction in the fundamentals of our faith through a knowledge and love of the Scriptures." MUELLER.

"Home and Family Life" was the subject of investigation of a special committee of the recent New Orleans convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the group was forced to report: "Allowing for notable and beautiful exceptions, it is generally true that in America the home has ceased to function. This accounts for the increase in lawlessness, immodesty, and juvenile depravity." This is also the gist of the recent report of the Federation of Churches on Prohibition. P. L. Blakely writes in *America* of October 31: "The boys and girls of to-day, allowing for notable and beautiful exceptions, are growing into maturity, fearing neither God, man, nor the devil. Evil is in the magazines they read, the theaters they visit, the amusements in which they engage, the clothes they wear, or, rather, dispense with, the company they keep, and the resorts, sometimes referred to as 'home,' in which they live. Foolish, weak, and criminally negligent parents either impose no check whatever upon them or themselves set a bad example." The Jesuit writer, in proposing a remedy, quotes the above committee: "Let all Christian churches enter upon a vigorous campaign to check the existing evils by preaching and instruction," and commends the work of Catholic preaching and other agencies in carrying out the suggestion. We demur to Catholic preaching, but encouragement to the Church which still fosters the pure Word, the only remedy for the situation, is certainly not amiss. MUELLER.

Is Family Prayer Practicable? — On this subject an exchange paper has the following to say: "Whether we practise it or not, all of our convictions are on the side of family prayer. Where it is neglected or given up on account of our busy lives, we are ashamed. The difficulty in most homes is to find the right hour. In wide travel and in the conditions of many Christian homes we have found the breakfast table the most satisfactory place and time for family worship. Families are so scattered during the day and evening that covenient hours are difficult to settle upon. Dr. John Timothy Stone writes in the *Continent* concerning the family altar: 'First of all, it evidences orderliness and regularity in home duties. It binds the family in the genuine and lasting bonds of devotion and piety. It stamps the householder a God-fearing one. It teaches parents as well as children to pray. It acts as a poise and adjuster in all difficulties and problems and relates them rightly to God in their settlement. It is a pacifying as well as harmonizing force always. It weaves itself into the very fabric of domestic life, and time and use never wear out its sacred and blessed figures.'" MUELLER.

The Triennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America was held at New Orleans October 12—November 2. One of the outstanding acts of the assembly was the approval of the election by the House of Bishops of the Rt. Rev. John Gardner Murray, seventh Bishop of Maryland, to be the first elected Presiding

Bishop of the Church. Other results of the convention are of more general significance. Despite the argument of Bishop Brent of Western New York, with a following of half of the convention, the motion to enter the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America failed of the necessary two-thirds vote. Against the insinuation that this is a victory for the Anglo-Catholic party, which prides itself on the ecclesiastical tradition of the Episcopal Church in contrast with the ecclesiastically doubtful parentage of the Puritan and other Reformation-born sects, the conservative element pointed out that the Roman Catholic Church "recognizes no cousins," and that it is not antagonistic to the Federal Council. Bishop Johnson called the Federal Council a "visionary experiment." Bishop Brent, in opposition, chiefly argued that Christian churches should unite against the impending tide of Eastern paganism, which argument was met by Bishop Gailor with the rejoinder that some churches in the Council were "hindering the cause of Christ." — It was decided to continue to refuse Christian burial to suicides, excommunicates, and unbaptized infants. The proposal to introduce into the *Book of Common Prayer* 54 saints, to be printed in black type in distinction from the red of the "undisputed saints," was rejected. It was decided not to drop the common chalice in the administration of the Communion. A motion to strike out the word "Protestant" before the name of "Episcopal Church" on the title-page of the *Book of Common Prayer* was tabled. The prayer-book received other corrections, however: The 39 Articles of Faith adopted in 1562 to distinguish the Church from the Roman Catholic and other Protestant churches were stricken out, likewise "obey" and "with all my worldly goods I thee endow" in the marriage service, also such "medieval" expressions as "the vengeance of God," "the wrath of God," and "miserable sinners." The Litany was amended to petition for those "who travel by land and water or *by air.*" — A memorial was adopted calling for the adhesion of our Government to the World Court. — The Pastoral Letter read at the conclusion of the convention, in the words of *Time* (November 2, 1925), "avoided controversial creedal questions," but contained this veiled thrust at Fosdickism: "We would especially warn our people against the superficial and false antithesis, just now often dwelt upon, between the religion of Christ and the religion about Christ. No such differentiation can be made by those who believe in Jesus Christ as God. There is no such antithesis in the New Testament. We need both the religion about Christ and the religion of Christ, and the Church and the Scriptures give us both." MUELLER.

Advertising One's Religion. — Several weeks ago there appeared daily for a week, in the *New York Times,* a little advertisement, four inches wide and two and one half inches deep, at a cost to the advertiser of $84 daily, with the notice: "These advertisements inserted daily, and paid for, by a native Pittsburgh Catholic business man who believes in his religion," giving paragraphs on Catholic customs, famous Catholics in the world of history and achievement, and Catholic doctrine and apologetics. Interesting among the latter

is: *"Scandal.* — Christ never guaranteed that His Church would be free of scandals; but He did guarantee that it would not teach error. There were grave scandals in the Church in the time of Christ. Judas was a thief, as well as a traitor and a suicide. Peter was a perjurer, James and John quarreled, and so did Peter anl Paul. All Catholics readily admit the Catholic Church needed house-cleaning in the sixteenth century; but the Reformers set about, not to clean the house, but to dynamite it. If a child has a dirty face, you do not kill it; you wash its face. But in spite of the unholy lives of many Catholics in the sixteenth and other centuries, the Catholic Church never has taught, does not now, and never will, teach error. Consult your Bible, Matt. 28, 20: 'And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'" The point of this type of advertising is well put by *Time* (October 26): "It is a commonplace of advertising that to be successful one must be sincere. The Pittsburgher's institutional advertising argues sincerity at least."

MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — It may do us all good to read William Johnston's "If I Were a Clergyman" in *Collier's Weekly* for October 10. *Fas est ab hoste doceri.*

When you dip into *Social Progress: A Handbook of the Liberal Movement,* just out, you will find that what we used to call "novel" is now called "progressive."

The *Nation* (October 28) claims that Solomon wrote: "Spare the rod and spoil the child," and discredits the maxim by lampooning its supposed author thus: "Solomon had so many wives that he probably did not know his own offspring by name, nor which were his and which the neighbor's; it is not surprising that he found the rod desirable, or at least easy; but it is a pity that his ignorant maxim is applied in the single small family to-day as if it were eternal wisdom." It makes no difference whether Solomon or some one else wrote Prov. 13, 24, the sentiment there expressed is "eternal wisdom," and the better part of mankind has been, and is being, raised on it. For the other part we have to have jails, gallows, and a hell.

Suicide is coming more and more to be regarded as the legitimate ending of life and is so proclaimed in modern literature. When the twentieth century *roué,* after "taking each night a new love to his bed," has had "each day to check the failure of a trial to find an hour's forgetfulness," he turns the knife against himself. Llewelyn Powyo, in *Ebony and Ivory,* two years ago, even called any person a fool for not committing suicide; for he wrote: "If our days in the garden of the earth are in reality so uncertain, so brief; if there is indeed so little time for any of us to play under the blackthorn; if, indeed, as was made clear to me then, death cannot be gainsaid, then surely *the secret of so sorry and insecure an existence must lie in detachment; for he who would lose his heart to a life so beset with tragedy had best have a care for his wits.*"

If you are still interested in the question who caused the late World War, read the memoirs of Viscount Grey (*Twenty-Five Years, 1892—1916*), just published by the Frederick A. Stokes Company. His name is Grey.

Bruno Pinkney, of New York, is wondering in the *Nation* (October 28) why the banking house of Otto H. Kahn and other banking houses of Wall Street, which were frenzied declaimers on the love of liberty and against Emperor Bill, who had to be canned to give everybody a decent chance to love liberty, — why these banking houses are now so silent about Abdel Krim and the Riffs, who surely love liberty. Bruno Pinkney is even so abandoned as to suspect that the late transactions at Washington with representatives of foreign governments regarding their debts to the United States are really the work of our superpatriotic big war profiteers, who are

now doing their well-known salient work toward reduction of the Allied war debts in order to enhance the value of Allied securities held by our big financial interests.

We all remember, among the great variety of "German atrocities" during the World War, this particularly shocking one, *viz.*, that the Germans were utilizing the bodies of their dead in order to obtain fats and other things needed for fertilizing and for the making of ammunition; moreover, that this fact had been revealed by a German soldier who was employed in the factory where the dead bodies were being boiled down and who suddenly discovered that the body of his own brother was among those to be boiled down. Well, now here comes General James E. Charteris, Chief of Intelligence of the British Army during the war, and declares at a dinner at the National Arts Club in New York City that he invented this lie and forged the diary of the German soldier that was used for propping up the lie all over England. He said he had to resort to this strategy "to get the Americans into the war."

Both state and privately organized universities are receiving huge bequests, more or less conditioned, from capitalists. A movement has begun to prevent state universities at least from accepting such bequests. The reason is patent: capitalism wants to obtain a controlling influence on educational establishments because of their immense power for influencing the public mind and shaping the future. Mammonized educational facilities would be about the worst blight that could fall upon us. But what a compliment to education these bequests represent!

The Connecticut Conference of the Lutheran New York Ministerium adopted a resolution on evolution that meets all requirements: "As a scientific working hypothesis, evolution does not necessarily conflict with the Christian's faith in his God. But the philosophy of atheistic, pantheistic, and also theistic evolutionists is decidedly antichristian. It ascribes everything which faith knows as the working of God — creation, redemption, as well as the perfection of man — to evolution. It denies even the truth of the Gospel. It is not science, but pure unbelief."

"If throngs of eager children can be assembled for the purpose of deepening their knowledge of the providential civilization saved for them beyond the wreckage of nations and of philosophies, then let us reverence the glory of their youth and nurture it with a fine fervor, with no misunderstandings amongst ourselves, but *conscious always of the society we hope — as did the heroic among our forefathers — to create in America. For the arts and sciences, all of them, are the levers with which the future will be controlled.*" (Italics ours. *The Commonweal*, October 21.) This shows that the program voiced at the First Catholic Missionary Congress at Chicago in 1910, *viz.*, to "make America Catholic," has not been forgotten and never will be. Moreover, it is sure of success because it works by the method of educating its youth — the infallible road to success. And because Protestants do not educate, their cause is doomed.

"Cafeteria education" is what Bishop Irving Johnson of the Episcopal Church recently called the picking and pecking at this or that study which the dilettante pursues at our great institutions and for which the institution must serve ever so many electives. The addicts to this sort of education may be munching educational tidbits for six years without eating a single square meal.

In a commendatory notice of Dr. Zorn's *Last Apostolic Word* in the *Lutheran* (October 29) J. A. S. speaks of the author's "somewhat extreme attitude on lodges and unionism" and remarks: "If these are as godless as the author assumes, they should be opposed as a matter of course." *O sancta*, etc.!

Referring to the recent world series of baseball the *Lutheran's* Washington correspondent remarked: "When the game is played on Sunday, all Christians regret it, though otherwise it is a desirable game." It would be interesting to learn the exact cause of the regret. There are reasons for regret when some people attend a game on Monday or Tuesday, etc.

The Universal Knowledge Foundation, New York, has in five volumes of 2,622 pages attempted the impossible, *viz.*, to establish the thesis that "Roderic de Borgia, Pope Alexander VI, has been a man of good moral character and an excellent Pope." The author is Peter de Roo, and the title of his book, *Material for a History of Pope Alexander VI, His Relatives, and His Time.* All who differ from the author's findings are "arch-slanderers" and "discordant revilers." Sympathy with the author is in place. Ten times five such volumes as he has produced will not accomplish his end. DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

Proceedings of the Fifty-Fifth Convention of the Michigan District. 56 pp. 35 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

A German essay by Pastor H. C. F. Otte on the words "I Believe in the Forgiveness of Sin," and an English essay by Pastor A. F. Bernthal on the question, "Why Must We Continue Steadfast in Believing and Teaching the Inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures?" are features of these printed minutes which commend them to our readers. FRITZ.

Elementary Bible History. 211 pp. $1.00. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

We take great pleasure in announcing this new *Elementary Bible History*, which has recently left the presses of our Concordia Publishing House. The book contains a good selection of Old and New Testament Bible stories, fifty of each. The text of the Authorized Version is used. The table of contents groups the lessons as follows, *Old Testament:* Primeval History, The Patriarchs, Moses and the Giving of the Law, The Time of the Judges, The Undivided Kingdom, The Divided Kingdom; *New Testament:* The Youth of Jesus, The Public Ministry of Jesus, The Passion and Death of Jesus, The Glorified Jesus, The Church of Jesus. Each story is told on one page, with explanatory remarks at the bottom. On the opposite page of each story is a very good picture in colors. Above the picture is a Bible-text and a portion of the Catechism, both of which have been selected to enforce the lesson. Below the picture is a Bible legend. The syllabication and accentuation of proper nouns are given in the text, and a separate pronouncing glossary has been added. Four colored maps are given. Very durable paper has been used, and the type is sufficiently large and clear. This *Elementary Bible History* is the best of its kind we have seen. We recommend its introduction not only in day-schools and Sunday-schools, but also in the homes, for the very young children, to whom the mothers can read the stories and show the beautiful pictures. The editors, A. C. Stellhorn and Theo. Kuehnert, and our Publishing House deserve credit for getting out this book. In spite of the very expensive mechanical construction the price is not high. FRITZ.

The Doctrines of Modernism. By *Leander S. Keyser, A. M., D. D.* 101 pp. (The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.)

In this brochure the beliefs and misbeliefs of Modernism are weighed and analyzed, chiefly those that have been expressed in Fosdick's *The Modern Use of the Bible*, in Moffat's translation of the Old Testament, in

Mathews's *The Faith of Modernism*, and in the attitude which Charles R. Brown, Henry Van Dyke, and the editor of *The Christian Century* have assumed toward Christianity. The discussion is carried on in a spirit of fairness, the criticism is correctly placed and well taken, and the entire book offers good and reliable information in a handy form as to the spirit rampant in, and the desperate positions taken by, Modernism. DAU.

Modernism and Miracle. By *Paul G. Krutzky.* 61 pp. (The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.)

Also this well-written brochure has been called forth by Mathews's *The Faith of Modernism*, especially by the revamped rationalism of former centuries, which appears in that treatise wherever it discusses miracles. The brochure before us is an able dissection of the Modernist position and proves, what has been proved so often, that rationalism when applied to divine matters is most irrational. DAU.

Moments with God. By *Walter E. Schuette.* 402 pp., 4×5½. 75 cts. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.)

This book consists of devotional readings arranged for each day in the year. It differs from other books of the kind in providing for the reading of definite Scripture-passages, the contents of which are summarized in a special Bible-text. These readings are followed by prayers, in which the thoughts of the texts are utilized. The book is very practical and serviceable and, we are sure, will be appreciated by those who will use it.

MUELLER.

Christ Conquers. A Story of the Persecutions in the Second Christian Century. By *William Schmidt.* 325 pp., 5×7½. $1.25. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Here is an excellent story for Christian people. While the theme is somewhat trite, the author, nevertheless, has succeeded in producing an interesting tale, which vividly portrays inspiring scenes of Christian fortitude, zeal, and faithfulness in trying times. The writer weaves into his romance many important historical facts and thus enhances the didactic value of the book. We recommend it to all who like to read, or present to their friends, a wholesome Christian romance. MUELLER.

The Eisenach Old Testament Selections. *By R. C. H. Lenski, D. D.* 1120 pp., 6×9½. $5.00. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

There are especially three features which make this truly great work a real help to the pastor who is looking for material on Old Testament texts. First, there is system in the author's studies; throughout his work he follows a definite plan, according to which every detail is arranged. Secondly, the exposition of the texts is thorough and positive and induces the preacher to evaluate every important thought wrapped up in the passages. Some of the studies are veritable masterpieces of exegesis. Thirdly, every kind of flashy preaching has been strictly ruled out. The truth of Holy Writ is to be preached in a direct, simple, and becoming manner.

The reviewer is not in accord with every exegesis offered or every statement made, or every mold in which the themes are cast; nevertheless he cordially recommends this book to his fellow-pastors not only on account of the valuable material which it offers, but also because of the way in which it teaches the pastor how to dig out of the gold-mine of God's Word and present to his hearers the treasures of its precious teachings. The Old Testament certainly deserves a prominent place in Christian pulpits. This book shows how its many beautiful texts may be employed for instructing, warning, and comforting the Church to-day. MUELLER.

The Man of Sorrows. By *Albert T. W. Steinhaeuser.* 318 pp., 7½×5. $2.25. (Macmillan Company, New York, N. Y.)

This is a most impressive devotional volume in forty chapters, which affords a wealth of daily aid for a consecrated observance of Lent. There are few books which take up the successive days of Lent, in order, for special meditation. The author has therefore endeavored to supply the need by giving a meditation for each day. Each exercise consists of a brief introit or opening versicle, a Scripture-passage, an exposition of it in simple, direct language, a meditation in the tradition of St. Augustine, prayers, collects, and litanies, drawn from various sources, a sacred hymn or poem from ancient or modern writers, and a closing benediction. The reviewer rejoices at the publication of this book, since, in spite of numerous shortcomings, it sets forth the message of the Cross in a clear and convincing manner. MUELLER.

Beside Still Waters. By *G. W. Lose.* 90 pp., 5×7½. 75 cts. (Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This little book contains twenty-one short devotional chapters based upon the Twenty-third Psalm. Evidently they have grown out of the author's own devotional life, for they breathe the fine spirit of a sincere Christian who has long walked with God. At the end of each chapter there is a brief prayer of consecration. The contents as well as the arrangement are excellent. MUELLER.

Back to the Bible. By *George McCready Price.* 235 pp., 7½×5. $1.00. (Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D. C.)

The admirable defense of Christian truth which is found in the volumes of George McCready Price has won for the author the honest appreciation and thanks of many Christians. Professor Price writes interestingly, argues unanswerably, and fights most valiantly; especially against modern liberalism does he wield a sturdy blade. *Back to the Bible,* which here appears in a revised edition, deals with a number of interesting subjects, among which are: Neo-Protestantism, Geology and the Deluge, Modern Philosophy, The New Pantheism, Occidental Heathenism, etc. Practically every evil "ism" that threatens the Church of Christ to-day is exposed in this excellent book, which in spite of a number of faults — the author is a Seventh-day Adventist — is certainly worthy of close study.

MUELLER.

Liberal Christianity and Religious Education. By *Adelaide T. Case, Ph. D.* 194 pp., 5×7¾. $2.00. (Macmillan Company, New York, N. Y.)

The chief value of this book consists, first, in its accurate and lucid analysis of modern liberalism, and secondly, in its excellent presentation of the ways in which liberalism is seeking to spread its error through educational propaganda. The author is in sympathy with the aims of Modernism and points out methods by which it may approach those who still cling to conservative views. She writes: "We may expect to see a radical revision of the announced purposes of religious education. They will no longer be formal and static, expressed in generalities, more or less the same year after year.... The various boards and agencies will become more plastic.... Text-books will be rewritten, much of the present material being discarded and replaced by discussions of the great issues of our time." (p. 187.) Religious education, under the sway of modern liberalism, will be ethical and socialized and will have no place for the traditional teachings of orthodox Christianity. The author writes very frankly, and her book is valuable in showing what Modernists are endeavoring to accomplish. MUELLER.

The Absurdities of Evolution. By *Guy Fitch Phelps.* 142 pp., 5×7½. $1.25. (The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago.)

The purpose of this book is to point out the absurdities of evolution. In a striking manner the author exposes the folly to which the evolutionary theory leads. However, the book is more than a burlesque. It is based upon actual statements of prominent evolutionists and gives the reader a clear insight into the general scope and purpose of the evolution theory, which at present is a matter of debate and discussion everywhere. Evolution may be combated in various ways, and those who think that a *reductio ad absurdum* will be effective will find in this book the material which they need for that purpose. MUELLER.

Brief Mention.

Received from Augustana Book Concern: **The Man in the Bearskin,** by *John H. De Groot,* 191 pp., a story from the Dutch colony at Holland, Mich.; and **Lost and Found,** by *Emily Nonnen,* 125 pp., a story from a village named Fair View. **Nature Sketches,** by *J. A. Udden;* and **Teach Us to Pray,** a book of prayers for children, by *A. G. Anderson.* — From Concordia Mutual Benefit League: **Concordia Calendar for 1926;** edited and compiled by *G. A. and E. A. Fleischer.* — From the Ev. Lutheran Synod in Australia, E. D.: **Proceedings of the Ev. Luth. Synod in Australia, Eastern District,** assembled at Hochkirch, Vic., March 27—31, 1925. Valuable for the information about the missionary and educational activities of our brethren and for the doctrinal paper on "Christian Burial" by Prof. W. Zschech, which it contains. DAU.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

January.

PAGE

"The Pure, Clear Fountain of Israel." 1
The Theological Observer 8
Book Review 21

February.

Luther's Connection with the Divorce of Henry VIII of England and the Bigamy of Philip of Hessen 33
The Theological Observer 46
Book Review 57

March.

The Need of Study 65
Every Word Is Truth 68
The Theological Observer 75
Book Review 91

April.

"De Imitatione Christi." 97
St. John's Church in Catawba Co., N. C., One Hundred and Twenty-five Years Old 105
The Theological Observer 110
Book Review 118

May.

"New Translations of the New Testament." 129
St. John's Church in Catawba Co., N. C., One Hundred and Twenty-five Years Old 136
The Theological Observer 142
Book Review 159

June.

The Influence of Calvinism on the American System of Education.... 161
St. John's Church in Catawba Co., N. C., One Hundred and Twenty-Five Years Old 168
The Theological Observer 173
Book Review 190

July.

Conversion after Death 193
The Influence of Calvinism on Our American System of Education.... 202
The Theological Observer 206
Book Review 220

August.

PAGE

What Do We Learn from the Words of Institution about the Two Elements in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? 225
The Influence of Calvinism on the American System of Education 227
The Theological Observer 236
Book Review 248

September.

The Chronological Sequence of the Pauline Letters 257
How Shall We Celebrate the Anniversary of the Reformation? 262
The Theological Observer 269
Book Review 278

October.

The Meaning of Matt. 8, 21. 22 289
The Authority of the Holy Scriptures 294
The Theological Observer 301
Book Review 308

November.

Masonry in the Garb of Christianity 321
The Bible and the Sins of the Saints 326
The Theological Observer 335
Book Review 348

December.

When was Jesus Born? 353
Masonry in the Garb of Christianity 357
The Bible and the Sins of the Saints 363
The Theological Observer 369
Book Review 381